4: Mersadier--13 U-5 (1954) 1955 MS37 Senegal MS37
Thies
Wolof MS30
Serer FA32
Tukolor MS27
Fulani MS11
Soninke MS21
Bambara FA8

/397/

Table II

No.	Ethnic Group	Occupation	Income	Expenses
1	Sarakolé	Laborer	5,800	5,839
2	Peul	Orderly	6,100	6,726
3	Wolof	Laborer	6,500	5,383
4	Sérère	Laborer	6,700	8,251
5	Toucouleur	Orderly D. N.	6,745	6,772
6	Wolof	Mattress-maker	7,000	7,471
7	Wolof	Laborer	7,000	7,231
8	Wolof	Orderly	7,410	7,234
9	Wolof	Baker	7,500	7,842
10	Wolof	Cultivator	8,150	8,133
11	Moor	Auxiliary D. N.	8,940	9,067
12	Peul	Laborer	9,000	8,952
13	Wolof	Laborer	9,800	9,981
14	Wolof	Cultivator	10,000	8,092
15	Bambara	Laborer	10,000	8,501
16	Bambara	Auxiliary	10,675	10,013
17	Moor	Auxiliary	10,800	10,892
18	Peul	Spec. laborer	11,000	9,816
19	Toucouleur	Accountant	11,950	10,860
20	Bambara	Auxiliary D. N.	12,000	13,557
21	Wolof	Clerk	13,000	13,799
22	Wolof	Auxiliary	14,000	14,405
23	Wolof	Cultivator	15,000	9,182
24	Wolof	Cultivator	15,000	13,809
25	Wolof	Auxiliary D. N.	15,630	13,801
26	Wolof	Employee P. T. T.	15,800	10,238
27	Wolof	Shoemaker	16,200	10,600
28	Wolof	Worker D. N.	22,000	18,641
29	Toucouleur	Police sergeant	22,000	18,730
30	Wolof	Weigher D. N.	24,000	14,305
31	Wolof	Carpenter	25,000	21,571
32	Wolof	Cultivator	25,000	7,850

Thiés
Serer FA32
Wolof MS30
SONINKE MS21
BAMBARA FA8

/397 cont./ Table II (cont.)

No.	Ethnic Group	Occupation	Income	Expenses
33	Sérère	Chauffeur	25,000	15,706
34	Wolof	Employee P.T.T.	25,900	14,715
35	Wolof	Staff employee D.N.	27,000	16,654
36	Wolof	Private accountant	34,000	19,829
37	Wolof	Truck-gardener	36,000	23,680
38	Wolof	Jeweler	50,000	27,397
39	Sarakolé	Teacher	51,000	21,240
40	Wolof	Staffworker D.N.	55,000	31,004
41	Sarakolé	Head employee D.N.	55,500	21,105
42	Bambara	Chief worker, C.D.N.	56,000	24,548
43	Wolof	Doctor	81,000	34,612

/398 cont./

deficits of Nos. 24, 25, and 26, which are less significant. The slenderness of the deficit of No. 3 can be explained by the limited number of persons that the unit of consumption contains.

in the care of one of the families having the smallest income.)

This deficit is, of course, theoretical. Not having followed these families closely for an entire year, we cannot pretend to present an exact balance-sheet of their budget. It is possible that our percentages would be reduced in the course of a year, or a longer period, either by a reduction in expenses (reduction of consumption, or reduction of the unit of consumption itself) or by the creation of another source of income. The fact remains, however, that they do exist and that they are important.

It will be easy for us to show where they come from. It is almost impossible to explain rationally their persistence and their